



1200 G Street, NW
Suite 500
Washington, DC 20005

P: +1 202-628-6380
W: www.atis.org

May 10, 2021

Martin Dolly
PTSC Chair

Re: ATIS Letter Ballot PTSC-LB-261 Closing Letter

Dear Martin:

ATIS Letter Ballot PTSC-LB-261, entitled "PTSC-LB-261, *draft proposed ATIS Standard, Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) Resource-Priority Header (RPH) and Priority Header Signing in Support of Emergency Calling*" closed on May 7, 2021. The results are as follows:

15	Approvals Comments: Neustar, Ericsson, Perspecta Labs
0	Disapprovals No comments
10	Abstentions No comments
7	Ballots not returned
32	Voting members

The comments received will be addressed by the committee at an upcoming meeting. Should the resolution(s) be substantive in nature, a default letter ballot will be issued. If there are no substantive edits to the document, it will move to publication.

Sincerely,

[Original signed by A. Karditzas]

Anna Karditzas
Coordinator, Global Standards Development

Cc:
V. Shaikh, PTSC Vice Chair
J. Wohlgemuth

ATIS Letter Ballot Comment Submittal Form and Consideration Report

All commenters should use this form when submitting comments on an ATIS Letter Ballot ([view the instructions](#)). This form should accompany the [letter ballot \(via ATIS Workspace\)](#) and will subsequently be used during comment consideration by the appropriate committee/subcommittee.

The commenter should use the “track changes” feature when recommending changes to existing text. Proposed changes to a table, figure, or any other item that is not purely text, should include a summary in the table below and provide the modified table, figure, etc., in the “Other Information” section. The source file for any new figures (Visio, PowerPoint, etc.) must also be included (by either zipping together with this document, or embedding as a file/object).

Letter Ballot: PTSC-LB-261 (PTSC-2021-00017R000)

Company Name: Neustar						
TO BE COMPLETED BY COMMENTER				TO BE COMPLETED BY SUB/COMMITTEE		
Auto#	Page/ Section/Line #	Comment	Rationale/Suggested Solution	Type ¹	Res. ²	Discussion/Explanation/Note (if comment is modified, accepted/modified via a separate ballot comment, or not accepted)
1	Abstract	Remove extraneous “header”	Remove			
2	Line 9, 281	Consistent use of “header” when used with RPH	Change all to “Resource-Priority Header” to align with RPH acronym			
3	Line 9,126	Consistent use of quotes/double quotes	Review and change all to preferred symbol			
4	Lines 14-15	“trust domain implementation is set to remove it if it occurs from the UE”?	Change to “trust domain implementation removes it if set by the UE”			
5	Lines 14-15, 363, 378	Seems like preferred term is User Agent or UA?	If so and these terms are equivalent, change “User Equipment” to “User Agent” and “UE” to “UA” throughout			
6	Line 47	“caller identity authentication and verification”, I assume, is SHAKEN?	If so, consider changing to, “caller identity (SHAKEN) authentication and			

¹ Type of change: Insert **S** or **NS**: Substantive (**S**) (see [ATIS OP Section A.6](#)) or Non-Substantive (**NS**)

² Resolution (how was comment considered): Insert **A**, **AM**, **N**, **I**, or **W**: Accepted (**A**), Accepted as Modified (**AM**), Not Accepted (**N**), For Information/No Action/Noted (**I**), or Withdrawn (**W**).

ATIS Letter Ballot Comment Submittal Form and Consideration Report

			verification” to avoid any confusion and since used throughout document			
7	Lines 50-51	“The display of information associated with the verification of SIP RPH and Priority header values is also outside the scope of this document.”	Consider changing to, “Finally, the display of information associated with the verification of SIP RPH and Priority header values is outside the scope of this document			
8	Line 126	Consistent use of double quotes. One example, but should be checked throughout document	Change ‘esnet’ to “esnet”			
9	Line 105	“9-1-1” is not really a 3 digit code	Consider changing all to “911” except for “NG9-1-1”			
10	Line 143	“is trusted”	Change to “can be trusted”			
11	Line 147	“signing verification”	To avoid confusion, consider changing to just “verification” – OK with also removing note as proposed by editor			
12	Line 151	Extraneous “terminating”	Delete			
13	Lines 177-178	“attest” is required, at least for 82 API?	Not sure why optional for Ms? If so, not sure how it then complies with SHAKEN? “The PASSporT “shaken” extension shall include both an attestation indicator (“attest”), as described in section 5.2.3 and an origination identifier (“origid”) as described in section 5.2.4.” Suggestion discussed with editor was to make required in this document			
14	Line 185	“will include the value of the “identity” claim in an Identity header field”	Consider changing to “will include the signingRequest response data in an Identity header field”			
15	Line 190	Missing comma	Change to “caller identity, as well as”			
16	Line 203, 601	Grammar	Change “toward” to “towards”			

ATIS Letter Ballot Comment Submittal Form and Consideration Report

17	Line 222	Reference “originating service provider” same way	“Originating Service Provider” seems to be preferred			
18	Line 274	Footnote 4	Change “sent” to “sends”			
19	279, 300, 650	Consistent use of “Resource Priority”	Change all to “Resource-Priority” or “Resource Priority”			
20	Line 315	First normative references of “shall” and “must”. However, Clause (5) is entitled “Overview”? Only a few normative references (“must” or “shall”) in this section?	If meant to be normative for this standard, then it should just be clearer to reader where such normative text is included in the document. Discussed with editor to change title and note that this Clause contains some normative text			
21	Line 481	Note about AS is ambiguous	Consider adding, “processing (i.e., after routing URI has been determined)” or remove Note			
22	Line 506, 578, 733	Note about VS is ambiguous	Consider adding, “processing (i.e., before routing URI is determined)” or remove Note			
23	Line 525	Extraneous “forward”	Delete; OK if note removed as proposed by editor			
24	Line 527	Extra space	Change to “I-CSCF”			
25	Line 531, 534	Consistency	Change “route URI” to “routing URI”			
26	Lines 538-539	Generally, Identity headers are stripped after STI-VS and before sending to UA? If these need to be preserved, then should better clarify this	Discussed with editor and a footnote should be adequate			
27	Line 552	Why just this one (tagging) header and not an “Attestation-Info” header too as in Line 664?	Unless there is a significance, suggest that both these headers may be added per local policy			

ATIS Letter Ballot Comment Submittal Form and Consideration Report

28	Line 598	Extraneous comma	Change to “message is for further study.” OK, if this text is deleted as proposed by editor			
29	Line 606	Clarify normative clause	Change to “This normative clause...”			
30	Line 706	Grammar	Change to, “for the caller ...”			
31	Lines 744-745	Remove UUID parenthetical about Origination ID since defined in ATIS-1000074				

Other Information (e.g., Tables, Figures):

ATIS Letter Ballot Comment Submittal Form and Consideration Report

All commenters should use this form when submitting comments on an ATIS Letter Ballot ([view the instructions](#)). This form should accompany the [letter ballot \(via ATIS Workspace\)](#) and will subsequently be used during comment consideration by the appropriate committee/subcommittee.

The commenter should use the “track changes” feature when recommending changes to existing text. Proposed changes to a table, figure, or any other item that is not purely text, should include a summary in the table below and provide the modified table, figure, etc., in the “Other Information” section. The source file for any new figures (Visio, PowerPoint, etc.) must also be included (by either zipping together with this document, or embedding as a file/object).

Letter Ballot: [PTSC-LB-261]

Company Name: [Ericsson]				TO BE COMPLETED BY COMMENTER		TO BE COMPLETED BY SUB/COMMITTEE	
Auto#	Page/ Section/ Line #	Comment	Rationale/Suggested Solution	Type ¹	Res. ²	Discussion/Explanation/Note (if comment is modified, accepted/modified via a separate ballot comment, or not accepted)	
1	2/1.2/ line 61	Reword to improve readability	Change to: against unauthorized spoofing <u>of</u> , or tampering <u>of—with</u> , the information conveyed in the SIP RPH or Priority header. This				
2	2/1.2/ line 63	Add quotes around rph for consistency	Change to: how the PASSporT <u>“rph”</u> extension				
3	5/4.1/ lines 139-140	Add the word “a” to improve readability	Change to: A Service Provider can use the same Secure Telephone Identity (STI) certificates for signing <u>a</u> SIP RPH/Priority header as they use for telephone number (TN) signing, but is not required to do so.				
4	5/4.1/	The Note can be removed because	Remove the following note:				

¹ Type of change: Insert **S** or **NS**: Substantive (**S**) (see [ATIS OP Section A.6](#)) or Non-Substantive (**NS**)

² Resolution (how was comment considered): Insert **A**, **AM**, **N**, **I**, or **W**: Accepted (**A**), Accepted as Modified (**AM**), Not Accepted (**N**), For Information/No Action/Noted (**I**), or Withdrawn (**W**).

ATIS Letter Ballot Comment Submittal Form and Consideration Report

	lines 147-148	3GPP has defined a SIP header to carry the verification status associated with an RPH/Priority header	NOTE: The mechanism to convey RPH/SIP Priority header signing verification success/failure via 'verstat' in a SIP INVITE message is for further study.		
5	6/4.2/ line177-178	Add quotation marks for consistency Make inclusion of "attest" claim mandatory for consistency with ATIS-1000082 (even though optional in 3GPP TS 24.229)	Change to: the signingRequest includes "orig" and "dest" claims, "iat", and "origid". The signingRequest may <u>shall</u> also include an "attest" parameter that identifies the relation between the service provider attesting the identity and the subscriber.		
6	6/4.2/ lines 212-214	Modify to align with 3GPP agreements regarding definition of verificationResponse parameter to convey RPH/Priority header verification status	Change to: a "verstatValue" parameters reflecting the verification status of the Identity header associated with calling identity and a "verstatPriority" parameter <u>reflecting the verification status of</u> the Identity header associated with the RPH/SIP Priority header. The IBCF will include the 'verstat' <u>verification status</u> information in the SIP signaling sent towards the emergency caller.		
7	6/5/ line 218	Make section title more explicit.	Change to: <u>5 SIP RPH and Priority Header Authentication for 9-1-1 Overview</u>		
8	7/5/ lines 243-244	Modify parenthetical expression to align with NENA i3 draft standards which describe signing of RPH and Priority header in NG9-1-1 Emergency Services Network.	Change to: (unless a signed RPH and Priority header are received in the SIP INVITE associated with the a callback call from the a PSAP)		
9	8/5.1.4/ Footnote #4	Consistency in use of plural nouns	Change to: ⁴ Note that when using the Ms reference point defined in 3GPP TS 24.229 [Ref 2] to interact with the authentication		

ATIS Letter Ballot Comment Submittal Form and Consideration Report

			service, the authentication service will return identityHeader parameter(s) in the signingResponse(s) and . . .		
10	10/5.3.1/ line 362	Missing word “Call” in Proxy Call Session Control Function (P-CSCF)	Change to: Proxy <u>Call</u> Session Control Function (P-CSCF)		
11	12/5.4.1/ line 466	Add text to clarify description of call flow step to better align with figure.	Change to: Info and Origination-Id header fields. <u>The P-CSCF forwards the SIP INVITE to the E-CSCF.</u>		
12	13/5.4.1/ line 479	Delete footnote #5 since 3GPP has agreed on enhancements to Ms interface to support the conveyance of the “rph” claim and associated assertion value	Delete Footnote #5 and associated reference: “esnet.1”, along with the “orig”, “dest”, and “iat”. ⁵ ⁵The HTTP interface used over the Ms interface needs to be enhanced to support the conveyance of the “rph” claim and associated assertion values.		
13	13/5.4.1/ Step 12/ lines 501-502	Modify text to align with 3GPP agreements regarding use of identityHeaders parameter to convey signed RPH information in verificationRequest	Change to: The verificationRequest includes an identityHeader claim <u>parameter corresponding to the Identity header containing the signed caller identity information, an identityHeaders parameter corresponding to the Identity header containing the signed RPH information</u> for each Identity header received , as well as the “to” parameter containing the . . .		
14	13/5.4.1/ Step 14/ line 512	Modify text to align with 3GPP agreements regarding use of identityHeaders parameter to convey signed RPH information in verificationRequest	Change to: identityHeader fields <u>and identityHeaders parameters</u> , which validates the caller identity and RPH field signed by the originating service		

ATIS Letter Ballot Comment Submittal Form and Consideration Report

15	13/5.4.1/ Step 16/ lines 516-525	<p>Modify text to align with 3GPP agreements regarding the definition of a new parameter in a verificationResponse to convey RPH verification status;</p> <p>Update RPH verification status values to align with 3GPP agreements;</p> <p>Delete footnote #6;</p> <p>Delete Note</p>	<p>Change to:</p> <p>16. The STI-VS returns a verificationResponse to the ingress IBCF. The verificationResponse includes a “verstatValue” parameter that contains the results of the verification process associated with the signed caller identity and a “verstatPriority” parameter that contains the results of the verification process associated with the signed RPH. Depending on the results of the verification process, the “verstatValue” associated with the signed caller identity will be set to “TN-Validation-Passed”, “TN-Validation-Failed”, or “No-TN-Validation”, and the “verstatValueverstatPriority” associated with the signed RPH will be provisionally set to “Emergency-Services-RPH-Validation-Passed”, “Emergency-Services-RPH-Validation-Failed”, or “No-Emergency-Services-RPH-Validation”.⁶</p> <p>NOTE: The value of the “verstatValue” parameter used to convey verification results associated with a signed RPH are provisional, pending final resolution in 3GPP. The means for signaling ‘verstat’ information associated with an RPH forward in the SIP INVITE message is for further study.</p>			
16	14/5.4.1/ Step 17/ line 527	<p>Add text to clarify description of call flow step to include 3GPP agreements regarding the definition of a SIP header to convey RPH/Priority header verification status information</p>	<p>Change to:</p> <p>17. The ingress IBCF populates the content of the “verstatValue” in a ‘verstat’ parameter within the P-Asserted-Identity header and the content of the “verstatPriority” in the Priority-Verstat header field in</p>			

ATIS Letter Ballot Comment Submittal Form and Consideration Report

			<p><u>the SIP INVITE, and</u> passes the SIP INVITE to the I- CSCF in the NG9-1-1 Emergency Services Network.</p>		
17	14/5.4.1/ Step 23/ lines 538-539	<p>Add text to call flow step description to reflect 3GPP agreement regarding the definition of a SIP header to convey RPH/Priority header verification status information</p> <p>Add a footnote that provides justification for passing the Identity headers to the PSAP</p>	<p>Change to:</p> <p>23. The (exit) IBCF forwards the SIP INVITE to the i3 PSAP with the appropriate 'verstat' values <u>in the P-Asserted-Identity header, the Priority-Verstat header field, and the</u> Identity headers, and normal call processing associated with the emergency origination continues. <u>x</u></p> <p><u>x Delivery of the Identity headers allows PSAP call takers to use attestation level and verification status information to influence the handling of emergency calls.</u></p>		
18	14/5.4.2/ Step 2/ line 552-553	<p>Consistent with 3GPP TS 24.229 add text to allow entry IBCF to add Attestation-Info header as well as Originating-Id header, based on local policy</p>	<p>Change to:</p> <p>request and, based on local policy, adds an Origination-Id header, <u>to the SIP INVITE</u> to indicate from where the request was received, <u>and an Attestation-Info header to the SIP INVITE.</u></p>		
19	15/5.4.2/ Step 9/ line 576-577	<p>Update text to reflect the use of the identityHeaders parameter to convey signed RPH in a verificationRequest</p>	<p>Change to:</p> <p>verificationRequest to the STI-VS that includes an identityHeader parameter associated with the caller identity and an <u>identityHeaders</u> parameter associated with the RPH/SIP Priority header.</p>		
20	15/5.4.2/ Step 13/ lines 589-598	<p>Modify text to align with 3GPP agreements regarding the definition of a new parameter in a verificationResponse to convey RPH verification status;</p> <p>Update RPH verification status values</p>	<p>Change to:</p> <p>13. Depending on the result of verification, the STI-VS includes an appropriate indicator (not defined in this document) and returns a verificationResponse containing <u>a</u> verstatValue parameter <u>s (associated</u></p>		

ATIS Letter Ballot Comment Submittal Form and Consideration Report

		<p>to align with 3GPP agreements; Delete footnote #7; Delete Note</p>	<p>with the “identityHeader” parameter in the verificationRequest) and a “verstatPriority” parameter (associated with the “rph” claim in the “identityHeaders” parameter in the verificationRequest) to the IBCF. The “verstatValue” associated with the signed caller identity will be set to “TN-Validation-Passed”, “TN-Validation-Failed”, or “No-TN-Validation”, and the “verstatValueverstatPriority” associated with the signed RPH/SIP Priority header will provisionally be set to “Emergency-ServicesECB-RPH-Priority-Header-Validation-Passed”, “Emergency-ServicesECB-RPH-Priority-Header-Validation-Failed”, or “No-Emergency-ServicesECB-RPH-Priority-Header-Validation”.⁷</p> <p>NOTE: The value of the “verstatValue” parameter used to convey verification results associated with a signed RPH/SIP Priority header are provisional, pending final resolution in 3GPP. The means for signaling the ‘verstat’ information associated with the RPH/SIP Priority header in the SIP INVITE message, is for further study.</p>			
21	15/5.4.2/ Step 14/ line 600	Add text to clarify description of call flow step to include 3GPP agreements regarding the definition of a SIP header to convey RPH/Priority header verification status information	<p>Change to:</p> <p>14. The IBCF <u>populates the content of the “verstatValue” in a ‘verstat’ parameter within the P-Asserted-Identity header and the content of the “verstatPriority” in the Priority-Verstat header field in the SIP INVITE, and continues to set up the callback call to the CSCF.</u></p>			
22	16/6.1.1/ line 623	Remove text referencing 3GPP TS 24.229.	<p>Change to:</p> <p>While not yet addressed in 3GPP TS 24.229 [Ref 2], theThe IBCF shall also</p>			

ATIS Letter Ballot Comment Submittal Form and Consideration Report

			determine the RPH value to be verified by			
23	16/6.1.1/ lines 629-632	Update text to reflect 3GPP agreements regarding the SIP header used to convey RPH verification status.	Change to: The entry IBCF will also populate <u>a Priority-Verstat header field</u> the 'verstat' value associated with the RPH in the outgoing SIP INVITE, based on the associated <u>"verstatPriority" parameter</u> verstatValue returned in the verificationResponse, <u>to convey the verification status of the Identity header associated with the RPH.</u> How the "verstatValue" reflecting the verification status of the Identity header associated with the signed RPH is populated in the outgoing SIP INVITE is for further study.			
24	16/6.1.1/ lines 653-656	Update text to reflect 3GPP agreements regarding the SIP header used to convey RPH verification status.	Change to: The entry IBCF will also populate the <u>'verstat' value</u> verification status associated with the signed RPH/SIP Priority header in <u>a Priority-Verstat header field in</u> the forwarded SIP request, based on the associated <u>verstatValue</u> "verstatPriority" parameter returned in the verificationResponse. How the verification status of the Identity header associated with the signed RPH/SIP Priority header is populated in the outgoing SIP INVITE is for further study.			
25	17/6.2/ line 706	Missing word	Change to: (corresponding <u>to</u> the caller identity and RPH/SIP Priority header) to the SIP INVITE . . .			
26	18/6.3/ line 717	Missing word	Change to: In the context <u>of</u> emergency calling, the STI-VS provides . . .			

ATIS Letter Ballot Comment Submittal Form and Consideration Report

27	18/6.3/ lines 729-731	Update text to reflect 3GPP agreements regarding parameters in the verificationResponse and new SIP header	<p>Change to:</p> <p><u>The-If an Ms reference point is used to interact with the STI-VS, the STI-VS will return a “verstatValue” parameters (associated with the “identityHeader” parameter in the verificationRequest) and a “verstatPriority” parameter (associated with the “rph” claim in the “identityHeaders” parameter in the verificationRequest) –in the–an HTTP verificationResponse. If a SIP interface is used to interact with the STI-VS, the STI-VS will return a ‘verstat’ parameters in the P-Asserted-Identity or From header, and a Priority-Verstat header field in a SIP INVITE to convey the results of the verification.</u></p>
----	-----------------------------	--	--

Other Information (e.g., Tables, Figures):

ATIS Letter Ballot Comment Submittal Form and Consideration Report

All commenters should use this form when submitting comments on an ATIS Letter Ballot ([view the instructions](#)). This form should accompany the [letter ballot \(via ATIS Workspace\)](#) and will subsequently be used during comment consideration by the appropriate committee/subcommittee.

The commenter should use the “track changes” feature when recommending changes to existing text. Proposed changes to a table, figure, or any other item that is not purely text, should include a summary in the table below and provide the modified table, figure, etc., in the “Other Information” section. The source file for any new figures (Visio, PowerPoint, etc.) must also be included (by either zipping together with this document, or embedding as a file/object).

Letter Ballot: **[PTSC-LB-261]**

Company Name: [Perspecta Labs]						
TO BE COMPLETED BY COMMENTER				TO BE COMPLETED BY SUB/COMMITTEE		
Auto#	Page/ Section/ Line #	Comment	Rationale/Suggested Solution	Type ¹	Res. ²	Discussion/Explanation/Note (if comment is modified, accepted/modified via a separate ballot comment, or not accepted)
1	Abstract	“SIP RPH field” → “SIP RPH header field”	Terminology consistency			
2	23 +	“RPH and Priority header” → “RPH/Priority header”	Terminology consistency			
3	127	“network” → “network,”	Improved readability			
4	149	Delete blank line	Consistent formatting			
5	144, 150	Consider breaking items 9 and 10 into separate assumptions if verstat and handling might potentially be different based on Caller ID vs. RPH validation	Increased flexibility of formulation.			
6	173 +	“egress IBCF” → “exit IBCF” and “ingress IBCF” → “entry IBCF”	Terminology consistency			
7	213	Is verstat needed for RPH? It's FFS in 5.4.1	Provide another FFS disclaimer?			

¹ Type of change: Insert **S** or **NS**: Substantive (**S**) (see [ATIS OP Section A.6](#)) or Non-Substantive (**NS**)

² Resolution (how was comment considered): Insert **A**, **AM**, **N**, **I**, or **W**: Accepted (**A**), Accepted as Modified (**AM**), Not Accepted (**N**), For Information/No Action/Noted (**I**), or Withdrawn (**W**).

ATIS Letter Ballot Comment Submittal Form and Consideration Report

8	220	“Resource-Priority Header (RPH)” → “RPH”	Redundant acronym definition.			
9	249	“5.1 Protocol Support for SIP RPH and Priority header Signing of Emergency Calls and Callback Calls” → “5.1 Protocol Support”	Simplification suggestion. Entire scope of the document is SIP RPH and Priority header Signing of Emergency Calls and Callback Calls.			
10	266	“can both be used to determine” → “can be used to determine”	Deleted potentially confusing word”			
11	299	“5.1.4 Assertion Values for a Resource Priority Header Claim and Specification of SIP Priority Header Claim in Support of Emergency Services Networks” → “5.1.4 Assertion Values”	Simplification suggestion.			
12	313	“Header” → “header”	Correction of typo			
13	313	Why dissimilar from RPH header field?	Provide clarification.			
14	328-329	After the PASSporT header and claims have been constructed, their signature is generated normally per the guidance in IETF RFC 8225 [Ref 14] using the full form of PASSporT.	Should this sentence include a “shall”?			
15	332 +	“must” → “shall”	Consistency of terms.			
16	339	“5.3 Reference Architecture for SIP RPH and Priority Header Signing” → “5.3 Reference Architecture”	Simplification suggestion.			
17	340-341	“5.3.1 Reference Architecture for SIP RPH Signing Associated with Emergency (9-1-1) Originations” → “Emergency (9-1-1) Originations”	Simplification suggestion.			
18	346	“signing of identity information if available in an incoming request. →	Addition of commas for improved readability.			

ATIS Letter Ballot Comment Submittal Form and Consideration Report

		“signing of identity information, if available, in an incoming request.”			
19	369	Delete blank line	Formatting consistency.		
20	392, 396, 398, 401, 403	Consider deleting “logical.” It’s a given that an element can be logical or physical depending on the implementation. Not used in prior clause for IMS elements.	Simplification.		
21	402	Add: “(Any element that accesses the key store (i.e., STI-AS) should also be highly secure.)”	Clarification indicating the need for highly-secure key store access.		
22	415 (414)	“5.3.2 Reference Architecture for SIP RPH and Priority Header Signing Associated with Callback Calls” → “5.3.2 Callback Calls”	Simplification		
23	438 (437)	Is this paragraph the case where the Transit Function is not configured?	Provide clarification.		
24	455 (454)	“5.4 SIP RPH Signing Call Flows for Emergency Calling” → “5.4 Call Flows”	Simplification		
25	456 (455)	“5.4.1 SIP RPH Signing Call Flow for Emergency (9-1-1) Originations” → “5.4.1 Emergency (9-1-1) Originations	Simplification.		
26	473-483	Use sub-bullets as indicated.	Improved readability.		
27	529 (528)	Delete blank line.	Formatting consistency.		
28	544 (543)	“5.4.2 SIP RPH and Priority Header Signing Call Flow for Callback Calls” → “5.4.2 Callback Calls”	Simplification.		

ATIS Letter Ballot Comment Submittal Form and Consideration Report

29	550-551 (549-550)	“1. The PSAP Call Handling Function initiates a callback call with the callback URI from the original emergency call in the To header...” → “1. The PSAP Call Handling Function initiates a callback call with the callback URI derived from the original emergency call To header...”	Improved readability.			
30	563 (560)	Delete blank line.	Formatting consistency.			
31	571-572 (568-569)	“7. The Transit Function routes the SIP INVITE (with the Identity headers) over the NNI using standard inter-domain routing resolution to the egress IBCF.” → “The Transit Function routes the SIP INVITE (with the Identity headers) to the exit IBCF using standard inter-domain routing resolution.	Improved accuracy and readability.			
32	583 (579)	Delete blank line.	Formatting consistency.			
33	594-595 (589-590)	“the STI-VS includes an appropriate indicator (not defined in this document)...” → “the STI-VS includes an appropriate indicator of the verification result (defined in [Ref 2])...”	Added reference. Improved readability.			
34	605 (600)	“14. The IBCF continues to set up the callback call to the CSCF.” → “The IBCF receives the response from the STI-VS, decides what to do based on local policy, sets the verstat in the SIP message, etc. and forwards the SIP INVITE.”	Suggestion for providing additional detail.			

ATIS Letter Ballot Comment Submittal Form and Consideration Report

35	606 (601)	“15. The CSCF continues to set up the callback call toward the emergency caller.” → “The CSCF strips the RPH header and forwards the SIP INVITE to the emergency caller.”	Suggestion for providing additional detail.			
36	630 + (625 +)	“assuming the Ms reference point.” → “via the Ms reference point”	Clearer wording.			
37	643 + (638 +)	“entry point IBCF” vs. “entry IBCF”	Need consistent terminology throughout?			
38	644 (639)	“and once the message is validated,”	Clarify how it validates the message, since Caller ID and RPH have not yet been signed.			
39	657 (652)	“this parameter” → “the “verstatValue” parameter”	Clarification.			
40	660 (655)	“based on the associated verstatValue returned” → “based on the associated “verstatValue” parameter returned”	Clearer wording.			
41	676 (670)	“The exit point IBCF must remove the ‘verstat’ from the From header...” → The exit point IBCF must remove the ‘verstat’, if any, from the From header	Clarification.			
42	726 – 731 (720- 725)	“Assuming the Ms reference point, upon receiving an HTTP verificationRequest associated with an emergency (9-1-1) origination from an entry IBCF in the IMS NG9-1-1 Emergency Services Network (for emergency originations), or an HTTP verificationRequest or SIP INVITE from the emergency caller’s home network (for callback calls), the STI-VS retrieves the certificate referenced by the “x5u” field in the PASSporT protected header from the STI-CR. → “The STI-VS can receive a verification request in one of	Improved readability.			

ATIS Letter Ballot Comment Submittal Form and Consideration Report

		two ways: by receiving an HTTP verificationRequest associated with an emergency (9-1-1) origination via the Ms reference point from an entry IBCF in the IMS NG9-1-1 Emergency Services Network (for emergency originations), or receipt an HTTP verificationRequest or by receiving a SIP INVITE from the emergency caller's home network (for callback calls)., The STI-VS retrieves the certificate referenced by the "x5u" field in the PASSporT protected header from the STI-CR, and follows the basic certificate path..."			
43	736-737 (728-729)	"The verifier shall also follow the IETF RFC 8224-defined [Ref 13] verification procedures" → "The verifier shall also follow the verification procedures defined in IETF RFC 8224 [Ref 13]"	Improved readability.		
44	753-754 (744-745)	Add reference at end of sentence?	Clarification.		
45	754-755 (745-746)	"The P-CSCF may also populate a value of "esnet.1" in the RPH."	If the P-CSCF is doing the signing for emergency calls, should this be a "shall"?		

Other Information (e.g., Tables, Figures):